

Frequently Asked Questions Related to 2009-11 contracts

	Question <i>(Original Question)</i>	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
COUNTY CONTRACT QUESTIONS					
1.	SAPT GIA allocation appears to be higher than FY09 – is this what HRSA intended? <i>It appears that Whatcom's State GIA has increased. Is that true? If so, is that because of the Federal Stimulus? or something else? we would like to receive the entire calculation for STATE GIA in a worksheet.</i>	Every county's State GIA increased from the state/SAPT swap amendments that were processed in April 2009. The swap was a one-time only adjustment.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
2.	How is federal stimulus applied to the formula? <i>I'm uncertain how to read the spreadsheet on Federal Stimulus. How is that apparently negative number applied to the formula?</i>	The federal stimulus was pro-rated to each county by the amount of State GIA base and vendor rate increase available. This is a net decrease in State GIA.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
3.	Federal Grant is a three-month allocation – is this statement referring to SAPT? <i>About halfway down the page, where the explanation sheet says, "Federal Grants is a three month allocation", is that referring to SAPT GIA? If so what was the reason for only including a 3 month allocation for SAPT?</i>	No, this is only for special federal grants such as ATR, RUAD, and SIG.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
4.	It reads "Federal Grants is a three-month allocation." That would mean that the identified Federal grant money is only 1/3 of our anticipated 12-month allocation?	No, this is one-quarter of the 12-month allocation.	Don Lupien Island County	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
5.	Will CJTA be split out between the base, special projects, and innovative funds?	Yes, please refer to your Awards and Revenue page sent out with the county contracts.	Don Lupien Island County	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
6.	Are cuts to State GIA as a result in the FMAP change the same for counties and residential?	The change in FMAP, also known as federal stimulus, was spread to providers and counties who bill Medicaid. If a provider is not able to claim Medicaid, this change in FMAP doesn't impact them.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
7.	The methodology overview for the CJTA fund source contains the following language: "The full allocation will be included in the October contract amendment." Does this mean the 3-month July to October contract will be amended in October, rather than a new contract and the 3-month allocation figures can roll over into October?	Yes, the contract will be amended in October.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
8.	The methodology overview for the State GIA fund source state: 2007-09 Outpatient Vendor Rate Increase bow-waved which (FY09 level for FY10 & FY11)." This sentence is confusing – what does this mean?	The 2007-09 Outpatient Vendor Rate Increase is included in with your State GIA at the FY09 funding amount.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
9.	Is GCE funding included in the State GIA fund source as based on FY09 level?	Please see the attached spreadsheet regarding State GIA.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	6/30/09
10.	Spokane's CJTA allocation appears to have been reduced by approx \$18,000/year. If CJTA allocations were to be continued at the previous 07-09 biennial level, there appears to be an error in our allocation figure.	The error was due to the fact funds that are targeted for Garfield County were inadvertently spread across all the other counties.	Dan Finn Spokane		7/9/09
11.	I am a little unclear as to what is happening with contracts. I thought we were only giving 3 month appropriations in the contracts to the counties. That is why the CJTA Panel instructed DASA to issue 3-months appropriations. I'm not sure if the non-CJTA appropriations were for longer than 3-days.	We decided that the county contracts awards would be a 24-month allocation. The reconciliation process between the 3-month and 18-month contracts is not an easy task and creates a lot of confusion between finance and the counties.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
12.	As for amending the CJTA at the end of the 3 months, my assumption is we will be increasing the amount from 3 to a 12 month appropriation; so any unused money in the first 3 months will be rolled over so that the money can be used for the balance of the 12 month time period.	Ted Lamb produced the CJTA allocations for the counties. The 3-month allocation was also produced by Ted and was presented to the panel. I understood that the 3-month allocation was because the panel was unsure how 2009-11 allocations were going to be distributed. By only giving a 3-month allocation, this would give the panel time determine what the 2009-11 CJTA allocations will be.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question <i>(Original Question)</i>	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
13.	I also expect the any unused first year CJTA money will be roll over to the second year of the biennium (just like previous biennium)	Yes it is still a biennial allocation.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
14.	I'm not sure why the appropriation is off by \$18,000. I'll have to check into it when I meet with Melissa Clarey on Friday.	I can't speak to why the allocation is off by \$18,000. Whatcom County also has questions about their CJTA allocation. I sent the question to Pam and asked her to research. We may want Ted to review what we did last year compared to this and prepare a response to the counties.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
15.	How was treatment expansion calculated? What numbers were used to calculate treatment expansion?	In the 2009-11 Biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment expansion is included in your allocations. Attached is a spreadsheet that shows the comparison between last year's allocation split between state and federal compared to this year. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client. The client counts were developed using a comparison of treatment expansion clients served in 2008 and a projection of clients served through fiscal year 2009 based on actual clients served through April.		Melissa Clarey	7/2/09
16.	How were the performance expectations derived for GAU and Medicaid Clients?	The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations.		Melissa Clarey	7/2/09
17.	There is no mention of treatment expansion in the contract, nor is it listed on the A&R. Could you explain why?	Treatment expansion is no longer a proviso for DASA. Therefore, treatment expansion won't be listed separately on the awards and revenue page because DASA doesn't have to track the funds separately. However, the Legislature has directed DASA to prioritize services, ranking Medicaid and GAU clients above low-income clients.		Melissa Clarey	7/2/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
18.	When will the Q and A be posted or sent out?	It looks like it is going to be every few days.	Cammy Hart-Anderson – Snohomish	Lois	Email to Cammy, 6/29/09
19.	Program Agreement - Page 1: At the top of the page under the header "County Program Agreement" is the following date range: "07-09." Shouldn't this be 09-11?	Page 1: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011 Page 4: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011	Dan Finn Spokane	Travis	7/9/09
20.	Program agreement - Page 6, # 10: There is a client figure of 1,814 for each fiscal year. Is this an adult client figure only, if so, there is not a separate youth figure for the youth treatment expansion allocation. In the allocation spreadsheet we received last week, the annual adult treatment expansion figure listed was: 993. Can you please clarify.	Page 6, # 10: The number identified in each county agreement is an Adult client figure for each fiscal year.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
21.	Exhibit D ATR - Page 2, # 3(c): "Total for Biennial Contract: \$200,000" Just above this is the same, and correct, figure for the 3 month period July 1 - Sept 30. Please revise.	<p>The worksheets that the counties received last week did not include their base numbers and funding included in the total client performance expectations.</p> <p>As you have seen so far, DASA added \$200,000 to the current contracts for ATR services (and admin) through September 29th. We put this generic amount as a place to start to assure no interruption of services as we switched biennia.</p> <p>We anticipate adding funding to that amount with an amendment in the near future. Also, in the future we will allocate Year 3 funding similarly as we have (same base formulas). We are meeting in Spokane to discuss how we will stage Year 3 now that we might have continued ATR funding through 2014.</p>	Dan Finn Spokane	Travis	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
22.	Exhibit F Youth GCE - Page 1, #1 and 2: The allocation figure is \$189,200 and the FTE number is one. Spokane County funds 2 youth FTE's in several sites. Please adjust the FTE figure and corresponding allocation. Of note: the current 07-09 biennium allocation was a 21 month allocation for 2 FTE's for \$189,200. Please adjust.	Youth Treatment Expansion remains at the same level for the three counties: Spokane youth patient performance expectations are for the 24 month contracted period. This is their 2005 baseline of 487+ funding for 53 patients for a total of 540 for each fiscal year. Lewis youth patient performance expectations are for the 24 month contracted period. This is their 2005 baseline of 166+ funding for 52 patients for a total of 218 patients for each fiscal year. Thurston-Mason youth patient performance expectations are for the 24 month contracted period. This is their 2005 baseline of 359 + funding for 52 patients for a total of 411 for each fiscal year.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
23.	The Awards and revenue sheet indicates that SAPT funding runs until Sept. 30 of the fiscal year. Will we run into problems, (ie falling short of funding if we spend out by June 30th of the fiscal year?	This statement was on the A&R last biennium. This is merely a SAPT Block Grant requirement; the dates for spending the SAPT award are consistent with the dates on the face page of your contract.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
24.	The attached State GIA Breakout has GCE funds for both fiscal years, but these funds are not showing on our A & R or billing voucher. Was that a mistake or will the voucher be adjusted?	No, this is not a mistake. Counties have the flexibility whether they want to provide this service within existing resources. The dollars for youth GCE are included in the State GIA allocation, and should be billed under State GIA.	Joel Chavez, Benton/Franklin Counties	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
25.	Several months ago there was discussion about the ADATSA program going away this biennium, is that still the case or is ADATSA here to stay for now?	There is no change in ADATSA services.	Joel Chavez, Benton/Franklin Counties	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
26.	Re the Three-month County Program Agreement July 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009. (Agreement Number 0963-68025) - the A&R seems to have some problem areas in determining administrative funding allocations.. ATR - \$200,000 admin = \$22,222; CJTA - \$155,672 admin = \$17,297. Please provide an improved explanation of how the State Grant-in-Aid admin is determined.	The State GIA admin includes: State GIA prior to calculating federal stimulus, but includes low income treatment/detox reduction; Treatment expansion (which includes both state and federal share); CPT & CTI SAPT GIA CA Parents reunification The following formula was used to calculate admin dollars: (Allocation/.90)*.10. Counties can choose not to bill the entire amount of admin listed on the A&R.	Cleve Thompson Clark County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
27.	Special Projects: It was understood that no admin would be provided for TANF Treatment Services. The question is why has admin been removed from CA Chemical Dependency Professionals (CDPs) and from CA Parent in Reunification. In both of these areas DASA requires significant Administrative requirements. This apparent change in my opinion was not fully discussed and I am requesting that county administration be allow in both of these areas as it has been for several previous bienniums.	The admin for CA-CDPs is included in the FTE rate. Counties can take admin out the amount billed, but it is not a separate line on the A-19. CA Parent in Reunification is included in your admin allocation under State GIA.	Cleve Thompson Clark County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
28.	In a spreadsheet I received today it lists an annual budget of \$47,300 for each FY 2010 and FY 2011 for HASAP. Is this funding correct? If this is correct it is not listed in A&R - Exhibit A of our contract. Exhibit D -- HASAP in the second paragraph lists \$94,600 designated to these services for the Contract Period 2009-2011 biennium. The source of funding is listed as State Funds. This should be added to the A&R under Special Projects.	HASAP funding is not terminated. Counties can choose whether or not to provide this service within the existing allocations. HASAP should not be listed separately on the A&R as a special project because this service is rolled in the State GIA.	Cleve Thompson Clark County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
29.	Exhibit C -- ATR page 2 indicates: Time Period -- July 1, 2009 to September 29, 2009; Allocated Amount = \$200,000. This is for three months of the contract. The next line indicates: Total for Biennial Contract = \$200,000 -- This is incorrect and this line should be removed or the dollar amount on this line should be removed. Please check the A&R administrative costs allowed for all funding...	Page 1: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011 Page 4: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011	Cleve Thompson Clark County	Travis	7/9/09
30.	Also SAPT GIA 2011 admin base appears to be missing \$5,000. The 2010 allocation for SAPT is \$823,935 which is 10% higher than FY09. Is this what HRSA intended? There is a statement that SAPT GIA includes original 07-09 allocation which we cannot verify in our funding amount. Please redefine how SAPT GIA was calculated.	Every county's State GIA increased from the state/SAPT swap amendments that were processed in April 2009. The swap was a one-time only adjustment. The admin for SAPT was calculated using the total per year SAPT allocation less prevention. The admin allocation for SAPT will be lower in FY11 due to CTI and CPT prevention services not being allocated in the second year of the biennium.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
31.	TE admin base of \$284,610 appears to be calculated (according to the tabbed worksheet sent) by using our highest year FY09 of 159 clients and multiplying by the \$1,790/pp amount. The description indicates that both years will be used. Our TA report shows us as a strong 334 for 08 and 09 just through May and not including the July carryover. How was this calculated? What numbers were used?	In the 2009-11 Biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment expansion is included in your allocations. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client. The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
32.	I show Prevention as a 4% increase over 08-09 year. Is an increase for Prevention HRSA's intention?	There has been no increase in prevention services.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question <i>(Original Question)</i>	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
33.	CJTA is a 12% decrease over 07-09. Is that accurate?	DASA received an adjustment to the CJTA funds in the 2008 Supplemental. DASA did not allocate this reduction to counties. This reduction was included in the DASA carry forward level which decreases the amount of funding available for each county.	Jaculine Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
34.	If cuts to State GIA as a result in FMAP change were the same for counties and residential? It was disappointing to see that all the state dollars no longer needed for match were removed from county contracts.	The change in FMAP, also known as federal stimulus, was spread to providers and counties who bill Medicaid. If a provider is not able to claim Medicaid, this change in FMAP doesn't impact them.	Cammy Hart-Anderson Snohomish County	Melissa Clarey	6-30-09
35.	Another question from ACHS; what is the total amount of state funding being allocated for Tx Exp state match in the upcoming '09 –'11 biennium? And of that number, what percentage is going to the residential system versus the county/outpatient system?	The total state appropriation for treatment expansion, prior to federal stimulus being calculated, is \$14,490,000. Counties received 58.03%, direct outpatient providers received .65%, and residential providers received 41.32%.	Cammy Hart-Anderson Snohomish County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
36.	Under section 10. Performance Expectations The county shall provide services based on the identified performance service expectation of 109 number of medicaid or GAU eligible clients for each fiscal year of the 2010/2011 biennium. Where did the 109 number come from?	In the 2009-11 Biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment expansion is included in allocations. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client. The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations.	Jessica Litscher, APS Okanogan Behavioral Healthcare	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
37.	There is no mention of Treatment Expansion in our contract, nor is there a separate line item for Treatment Expansion on our Awards and Revenues. Weren't these baseline/number of medicaid clients to be seen goals based on expansion dollars? And if so, why would we have a goal to reach if there are no dollars attached to that goal?	The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations. Treatment expansion is no longer a proviso for DASA. Therefore, treatment expansion will not be listed separately on the awards and revenue page because DASA doesn't have to track the funds separately. However, the Legislature has directed DASA to prioritize services, ranking Medicaid and GAU clients above low-income clients.	Jessica Litscher, Okanogan Behavioral Healthcare	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
38.	When I look at the worksheet with the "2007-09 Allocations based on State/Federal Split" the amounts don't match my Award/Revenue sheet. I had assumed those would tie back to my Award and revenue sheet for 2007-2009 Biennium.	For the 2007-09 biennium, the state and federal needs to be added together to get to the total treatment expansion allocation listed on the A&R.	Sandi Hughes-McMillan Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
39.	I have a questions re: #10 Performance Expectations on Page 6. The number is 24. Does this include treatment expansion clients? If so, we only received \$9813 tx ex funding for FY10 (the equivalent of 5 people, and \$10272 for FY11 (the equivalent of 6 people). If our baseline is 16, then how did we get to 24 per year based on the funding? If it includes treatment expansion, shouldn't the number be 21 for the first year and 22 the second year, assuming DASA is still using the \$1790 formula?	In the 2009-11 biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment expansion is included in your allocations. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client. The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations.	Barbara LaBrash San Juan County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
40.	Funding allocations – why is CJTA only for 3 months?	The CJTA panel had not decided if the formula needed to be changed for 2009-11. In order to give more time for panel discussions and DASA to pull additional information, the panel agreed that the allocation should only be for 3 months. Contracts will be amended in October to include the full allocation for CJTA.	Barbara LaBrash San Juan County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
41.	I do not understand adult treatment expansion. Is this an annual allocation? 8 is the number of clients that is expected that we serve? I don't get how that relates to how many we've served in the past.	In the 2009-11 Biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment expansion is included in allocations. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client. The performance expectations include the 2005 baseline plus the new 2009-11 allocations.	Barbara LaBrash San Juan County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
42.	Are we to set aside the federal portion under TXIX?	The federal portion for Title XIX has already been set-aside for each county. Counties will need to set-aside the state portion of Title XIX match.	Barbara LaBrash San Juan County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
43.	The date on the cover page says 07-09, I assume you mean 09-11?	Page 1: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011 Page 4: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011	Jackie Henderson, Island County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
44.	On the Awards and Revenue page our total should be \$499,822 and \$938,350. We will have to have these changes made before we can get it through our process.	This has been corrected.	Jackie Henderson, Island County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
45.	We just received our contract from DASA, including the job description for the CA-CDP outstation position. It does not include the new language we suggested regarding training. I have attached it. Once again, there is little understanding in Olympia regarding the intent of Region 3 for this position.	Counties are welcome to do more than the minimum that is in the CA CDP statement of work, as well as report on more than is in the statement of work. The statement of work language and reporting is <u>minimum requirements</u> and is the same for all counties that receive funding for CA CDPs.	David Asia Skagit County	Sue Green	7/9/09
46.	At the top of the facesheet, it reads "07-09 County Program Agreement". Would it be possible to simply have this one change made on this page and have the facesheet emailed right back?	Page 1: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011 Page 4: 2007/2009 should read 2009/2011	Cammy Hart-Anderson	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
47.	Can we have a clear answer on the CA-CDP: can we take admin or not?	The admin for CA-CDPs is included in the FTE rate. Counties can take admin out the amount billed, but it shouldn't be a separate line on the A-19.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
48.	Can we take admin on the CA Reunification funds?	Yes, the CA reunification funds are included in your admin allocation under State GIA.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
49.	Was the HASAP funding terminated?	No. Counties can choose whether or not to provide this service within the existing allocations.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
50.	Was the youth group care enhancement terminated? (if no, where is the funding supposed to be?)	No. Counties can choose whether or not to provide this service within the existing allocations.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
51.	Was the adult group care enhancement terminated?	Yes.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
52.	Were all special projects terminated? (Retzil in Kitsap County?)	Yes, it is included with SAPT GIA.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
53.	How exactly were the admin total's calculated? They don't add up to a 10% calculation for the allotted amounts.	The State GIA admin includes: State GIA prior to calculating federal stimulus, but includes low income treatment/detox reduction. Treatment expansion (which includes both state and federal share). CPT & CTI. SAPT GIA. CA Parents reunification. The following formula was used to calculate admin dollars: $(\text{Allocation}/.90)*.10$. Counties can choose not to bill the entire amount of admin listed on the A&R.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
54.	How are TANF treatment funds supposed to be spent and can they be used as set-a-side?	Treatment service only. Yes, these funds can be set-aside as state match.	Regions 5/6	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09
55.	Do you know if there is a time line to get an answer to my concerns regarding losing 41.96% of our CJTA/Innovative Budget?	DASA staff discovered an error in the appropriation for CJTA. This error resulted in funds that should be reserved for services to Garfield County being combined into the allocations for other counties. The formula is being adjusted to reflect the funds for Garfield County.	Sherry Greenup Asotin County	Melissa Clarey	7/9/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
56.	Spokane's CJTA allocation appears to have been reduced by approx \$18,000/year. If CJTA allocations were to be continued at the previous 07-09 biennial level, there appears to be an error in our allocation figure.	The CJTA allocations are not based on the previous biennial level. The formula redistributes the dollars based on new county demographic information.	Dan Finn	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
57.	Question pertaining to the SRP: at the bottom of the form it asks for estimated and negotiated maintenance of effort figures for "low income" adult and youth fy 10 and fy11. Please clarify what needs to be negotiated in this area as we are implementing funding reductions intended for low income adults and it appears our youth tx expansion funding has been reduced as well?	We removed the MOE for adults, but kept the MOE for Youth because there is no reduction in services to youth.	Dan Finn Spokane	Melissa	9/30/09
58.	In Exhibit C Program Standards for CDP's in CA offices, it has Pierce listed as having 2 CDP's. We have only 1 FTE that is DASA/County funded. None that are funded by the Regional office, so that will need to be revised.	The statement of work has been corrected to reflect 1.0 FTE.	Penni Newman, Pierce County	Eric	9/30/09
59.	Is the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for youth maintained in contracts?	<p>Yes, the MOE would be maintained through the county agreement of numbers contained on the SRP. The SRP is referenced as part of the contract, but just not specifically speaking to the MOE</p> <p>1. Incorporation by Reference</p> <p>Each of the documents listed below are, by this reference, incorporated into this Agreement as though fully set forth herein, including any amendments, modifications or supplements thereto:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DASA County Implementation Guide (DCIG); b. Service Rates Plan (SRP); c. Exhibits attached to this Agreement; and d. Provider Worksheet (TPW) <p>SRP with the MOE amounts should be out before the end of July.</p>	Mentioned during 7/10 ACHS meeting.	Travis Sugarman	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
60.	Can 8% be used for administering a CDP position for the region? Can the Admin line be used or is a specific line delineating this needed?	The FTE amount includes county admin and salary/benefit costs for the CDP FTE. So, if Skagit county wants 8% to administer the CDP position, it comes out of their CA CDP allocation on the A&R. They would just bill it under BARS 94. On their books they would put a portion of the payment from us under admin (if they choose) and a portion under the CDP salary/benefits.	David Asia Skagit County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
61.	The Spokane County HASAP allocation of \$47,300 per FY is less than the previous allocation of \$51,600. Is this a mistake, or is this a new reduced allocation figure?	No. This is the correct amount.	Dan Finn Spokane County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
62.	Exhibit D ATR Page 2, # 3(c): "Total for Biennial Contract: \$200,000" Just above this is the same, and correct, figure for the 3 month period July 1 - Sept 30. Please revise.	The federal grants are only in the county contracts for the first three months of the biennium. In October counties will receive a separate contract for the federal grants.	Dan Finn Spokane County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
63.	Exhibit F Youth GCE Page 1, #1 and 2: The allocation figure is \$189,200 and the FTE number is one. Spokane County funds 2 youth FTE's in several sites. Please adjust the FTE figure and corresponding allocation. Of note: the current 07-09 biennium allocation was a 21 month allocation for 2 FTE's for \$189,200. Please adjust.	This will not be adjusted.	Dan Finn Spokane County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
64.	Contained in the DCIG in Chapter 1, page 3, is the Low Income Service Eligibility Table. Recently DASA emailed out the "Official 2009 Federal Poverty Level".	<u>Q. Who determines the Sliding Fee Schedule?</u> According to the DCIG, counties must approve the Sliding Fee that is developed by the provider. However, a more recently developed 2009 Poverty Table is available on the DASA Webpage. This is the same FPL table used for all contractors within the Health and Recovery Services Administration.	Cammy Hart-Anderson Snohomish County	Sandra Mena- Tyree	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
65.	I have gotten a couple of emails from counties asking for assistance in translating the Federal Poverty Level to match the Low Income Service Eligibility Table in the DCIG.	<p><u>Q. How do I translate the Federal Poverty Table to match the Low Income Service Eligibility Table?</u></p> <p>In the 2009-2011 Biennium, eligibility for low-income youth, adult, and PPW services will be income of 220% or less of the Federal Poverty Level.</p> <p>Eligibility differences between the former DASA Poverty Level table and the new FPL table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility will be at a lower income for patients with six or less family members. • Eligibility will be at a higher income for patients with more than six family members. <p>Patients who are already receiving services but did not qualify for low-income services under the former eligibility requirement, but do qualify for the new eligibility requirements, will be allowed to convert to low-income. Services delivered on or after July 1, 2009, will qualify as low-income services.</p> <p>Patients who are currently receiving low-income treatment services but no longer qualify under the new eligibility requirements will be allowed to be grandfathered in through June 30, 2010. If these patients still do not meet the new eligibility requirements after June 30, 2010, they will no longer be allowed to receive low-income services.</p>	Cammy Hart-Anderson Snohomish County	Sandra Mena-Tyree	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
66.	A-19 question -- what is the expectation for what is entered in the 3 categories under State Grant In Aid (GAU, Low Income and All Other).	Counties should identify the client eligibility type when billing for GAU and Low Income whenever possible. When it is not possible to identify client eligibility (prevention for one example), the billing amount would be put in the "All Other" column.	Amor Amante, King County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
67.	Now that we have a better understanding of the 3 State GIA categories, I think we need a couple of cells to be available based on the treatment: ADATSA TX: .51 Group & .52 Individual is only "All Other", so we will need .64 Case Management "All Other" to be available for ADATSA CM, currently it's not available to us. PPW TX: .55 Group, .56 Individual, .65 CM & .73 Assessment is only "All Other", so we will need .78 Expanded Asst "All Other" to be available for PPW Exp. Asst., currently it's not available to us.	A19s have been revised.	Emily Won, King County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
68.	Can we get an unlocked version of the A-19?	DBHR has decided not to distribute unlocked A19s.	King County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
69.	Why is Skagit County's Adult Case Management cell closed for Drug Court?	A19s have been revised.	David Asia, Skagit County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
70.	Since the State GIA has portions that are designated, i.e. the GCE, HASAP, can this be also be broken down in the award page, just like the SAPT which is broken down by Prevention & Prevention Training?	It was decided last biennium to roll these services into State GIA.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
71.	Footnotes for the County participation match programs say it includes State GIA, Federal SAPT and CJTA. Does the State Drug Court need not be matched?	Yes, State Drug Court requires \$ for \$ match. This was inadvertently left off of the footnote, but this will be clarified.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
72.	What alternative method can be used if we subcontract with vendors that don't report in TARGET? (Jim, this is PH Dept) This has been asked in previous biennium, but no definitive answer received yet. Answer is that we continue to contract and pay until answer is received. Any changes in this biennium to doing business in this manner?	There is no alternative method. Each provider must be able to enter their own information into TARGET.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
73.	Exhibit F Youth Group Care Enhancement Does this exhibit mention how many FTEs we have been given and what the per FTE is payment is?	No. Each county has the same amount of FTEs as they had last biennium.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
74.	Service Rate Plan and A-19 BARS #'s. Should the way we bill in the A-19 match what is in the Service Rate Plan?	The A19 includes the most current BARS codes. Use the SRP to determine the correct rate/amount to bill.	King County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
75.	I see from previous questions that the admin is calculated as (Allocation/.90) x .10. Also that for State GIA admin, the calculation includes the State GIA allocation, plus the SAPT GIA, and the State- Special Projects to include only the TANF Treatment Services and the CA-PAR for King County. In the admin calculations as shown by DASA, the admin has come to 11.11% for State Drug Court, ATR and CJTA. When I do the admin calculation for what is included in State GIA - I am coming up with 12.09%. Is this correct?	The admin calculation for state drug court and CJTA has been removed. The county can take up to 10% of the fund for admin. State GIA is still defined in the contract. The calculation was done prior to calculating the federal stimulus & was calculated on the total computable amount of treatment expansion.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
76.	From previous responses regarding the Treatment Expansion -- not sure what DASA #15 response means -- "In the 2009-11 Biennium, only the General Fund-State portion of Treatment Expansion is included in your allocations. Attached is a spreadsheet that shows the comparison between last year's allocation split between state and federal compared to this year. Treatment expansion was calculated using \$1,790 per client." Reading this, it seems that there is a Federal portion of the Treatment Expansion that was removed and is being held by DASA that should be included in T19 Setaside for the County. If DASA is holding the Federal amount for the Setaside, then how is the County reflecting that in the Service Rate Plan?	The Federal Title XIX for treatment expansion should be treated like all other Title XIX the providers receive.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
77.	In terms of Title Set-aside, the amount of set-aside will all come from the Award and Revenues in our contracts, is this correct? We cannot use the SAPT GIA, Federal Grants (ATR), and the CA CDP and CA PAR \$\$ to put in the match, is this correct? See also #7	Yes.	King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
78.	Also, Anne came back from ACHS with information and a statement made by Annette (whom I don't know) that was very confusing: The statement was "DASA is paying State Match for Medicaid for the providers." Do you know what was intended by that statement?	No, I don't recall Annette saying this at an ACHS meeting. DASA pays the provider the <u>federal Title XIX</u> match.	Jaculine J. Mitchell Whatcom County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
79.	Can you please confirm that counties receiving JAG funding for drug court are to use the entire amount allotted during the first year of the biennium.	Yes, all JAG funds must be used in year one of the 09-11 Biennium.	Mary Taylor King County	Earl Long	9/30/09
80.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For BARS .36 Interim Services, .42 Detox & .43 Sobering Services can we place all expenditures under "All Other" since it may be difficult for our Agencies to report their clients status? Request for Changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BARS .62 Transportation - request for "All Other" to be available for our ADATSA clients. BARS .64 Case Management - request for "All Other" to be available for our ADATSA clients. (previously requested) BARS .78 Expanded Assessment - request for "All Other" to be available for our PPW TX clients. (previously requested) 	We need to know GAU and Low Income charges vs. All Other. It's especially important for GAU clients since that population is part of the treatment expansion population.	Emily Won King County	Pam Mann	9/30/09
81.	In the Draft on Page 35, Under CJTA and drug court funding, item x. states that "Tests (UA/Breathalyzer) are limited to no more than eight (8) tests per month for each patient of which only four (4) may be UA. Is this correct, and if so why the change	Refer to October contract amendment.	Sarah Hinman Skagit County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
82.	On Target, GAU and low income are not separated out (that I know of). Does this mean our provider needs to keep track and report who is what to us every month along with the Target reporting?	There is a filter in TARGET and treatment analyzer for GAU clients.	Jaime Montoya Island County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
83.	In terms of Title Set-aside, the amount of set-aside will all come from the Award and Revenues in our contracts, is this correct? We cannot use the SAPT GIA, Federal Grants (ATR), and the CA CDP and CA PAR \$\$ to put in the match, is this correct? See also #7	Only state funds can be used as Title XIX match, except for CA CDP and CA Parents in Reunification funds.	Jim Vollendroff King County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09
84.	According to our fiscal department there is a new requirement for federal grants in excess of \$100,000 to go through specific procedures to assure the federal government (specifically the Department of Homeland Security and the Social Security Administration) that recipients using federal funding in excess of \$100,000 are not employing illegal immigrants. The procedures include a very lengthy "e-verify" process. We noticed that there is no mention of this in our new contract. Are you aware of this new requirement? Are awards for CD somehow exempted from this requirement? Does DBHR have plans to place this into the new contract at some point in time soon? What can you tell us?	I raised this question with our Block Grant Officer. She informed me that SAMHSA has requested clarification from Homeland Security but at this point they believe that it only applies to discretionary grants. She will let us know if we need to do anything.	Jaculine Mitchell, Whatcom County	Victoria Roberts Chief, Office of Policy, Planning, Certification, and Legislative Relations.	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
85.	Criminal Justice Match Requirement, Page 32. This appears to be a requirement pertaining only to state CJTA funding, as opposed to the new Federal JAG dollars. We would like to have this confirmed."	<p>County contracts say: <i>(3) Criminal Justice Match Requirement – Counties shall provide a local participation match of all DSHS provided criminal justice awards using the following formulas.</i> <i>(a) A dollar-for-dollar participation match for services to patients who are receiving services under the supervision of a drug court.</i> <i>(b) A ten percent participation match (as formulated in non-criminal justice, see above) for services to patients who are not under the supervision of a drug court applies but against whom a prosecuting attorney in Washington State has filed charge. "</i></p> <p>This is not only a CJTA requirement. The requirement applies to all revenues, CJTA and the JAG.</p> <p>How much match depends on who controls the money and the contracts. If the drug court contracts with agencies for the treatment then it is part of the drug court program; the match is dollar for dollar. But if the agencies are selected by the Alcohol and Drug Coordinator's office, there is only the 10% match.</p>	Dan Finn, Spokane	Earl Long, Criminal Justice/ Provider One Manager	9/30/09

	Question <i>(Original Question)</i>	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
86.	We just want to know if following the precedent already set by DBHR can we bill for services from August and September on the new amendment? We have 60 days to bill, but the amendment doesn't start until October 1, 2009.	<p>You will continue to bill off of the contract that is executed at the time.</p> <p>Whatcom County appears to bill no sooner than 6 weeks after the end of the month being billed, so I suspect your August billing will not be received by us prior to October 1, 2009, if the trend continues. In reviewing your billing trends for the last six months of SFY09, CJTA averaged \$25,425.21 and TANF Treatment never more than \$500. If nothing else, September would be billed after October 1, 2009.</p>	Jaculine J. Mitchell Whatcom County	Harvey Funai	9/30/09
87.	We have a A& R question. The date of the amendment which added our CJTA and TANF awards for the year is October 1, 2009. Was DASA's intention to end the 3 month allocations and begin anew with 9 month allocations (as is typical of an amendment) or was it to indicate that the additional money had been placed in the awards for 12 month allocations?	The amendment covers the entire biennium and the A&R Exhibit "A-1" will reflect things broken down by State Fiscal Year. The 3-month bridge contract was to provide approximately 1/4 of your first year's CJTA and TANF dollars. In your A&R Exhibit "A-1" will now see the full annual allocations (roughly Exhibit A (3 months) amount multiplied by 4) along with the biennium totals.	Jaculine J. Mitchell Whatcom County	Harvey Funai	9/30/09
88.	Clarification that the new JAG funding does not require a dollar for dollar match.	Yes, the JAG funding for Drug Courts requires a dollar-for-dollar match.	Dan Finn Spokane County	Melissa Clarey	9/30/09

	Question (Original Question)	Answer	Question from	Answer from	Sent out
89.	Revision of the contract to increase and separate on the A&R funding for both HASAP and youth GCE services to 24 month levels without decreasing the state GIA award, and to increase the youth GCE service from what appears to be one FTE to 2 FTEs.	As far as the HASAP and GCE issues, the amounts listed in the Exhibits are for 22 months of Group Care Enhancement for each service. Each FTE is paid at a rate of \$4300 per month. Both the figures in your contract reflect services from Oct 1, 2009, on through the end of the biennium for both HASAP and Youth GCE for 2.0 FTE for youth, and 1.0 FTE for HASAP. The total dollar amount is not broken up on the A & R, but included in your Grant in Aid line item. For services from July 1, 2009, through Sep 30, 2009, your bridge contract should cover those services at the level that you had in the 2007-2009 biennium. The new contract covers the entire biennium, 09-11. The calculations were made by taking the previous biennium totals and rolling them to the new biennium. I asked about this and there is just not any more money to add to the contract, and the amount you currently have is the amount that the state is offering for HASAP and Youth GCE.	Dan Finn Spokane County	Eric Crawford Supervisor, Contracts Section	9/30/09
90.	We need to have all of the CFDA numbers on the first (signature) page of the contract. Right now the only CFDA number listed is the Federal Block Grant (93.959). We also need to see the CFDA number for ATR and the CFDA number or numbers for the Drug Court JAG/ARRA funds.	The contract has been corrected. JAG CFDA number is 16.803	Dan Finn Spokane County	Pam Mann	9/30/09